LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
APR 22
1915

The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 6
No. 6

APRIL
1915

THE LAST CHICAGO ELECTION

FEMINISM A RETURN TO BARBARISM

"INALIENABLE RIGHTS"

SUFFRAGE IN WASHINGTON

THE "HYSTERICAL" AGE

THE LATEST SUFFRAGE ARGUMENTS

"THE CALL OF THE NEW LADY"

A MILITANT'S MILITANT PEACE PLAN

"WOMAN'S WORK"

IGNORANCE OF REAL ISSUES

"EXTENSIVE MOTHERHOOD"

Subscription, $1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1912, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., Under the Act of March 3, 1879

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

OFFICERS

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.

Vice-Presidents, Miss Mary S. Ames, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton, N. J.; Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha, Neb.; Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland, Me.

Secretary, Mrs. William B. Clover, Fairfield, Conn.

Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.

General Secretary, Miss Minnie Bronson.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. James M. Codman, Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. C. H. Davis, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Dayton, O.
Mrs E. Yarde Breese, Trenton, N. J.
Mrs. Frank D. Williams, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. H. F. Lyster, Detroit, Mich.
Mrs Clarence Morgan, Burlington, Vt.
Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon, Ga.
Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mrs. Robert Garrett, Baltimore, Md.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Elizabeth Burnell, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover, Mrs. Wm. B. Williams.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles H. Lawrence.
Recording Secretary, Miss Carolyn Taylor.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Wm. T. Howe, 41 Lorraine Street, Hartford.

DELAWARE

Organization Committee, Wilmington

Chairman, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. David A. Reinhardt.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Emily P. Bissell.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eugene Dupont, Jr.

GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Richard Cuyler King, Mrs. N. K. Troutman, Mrs. J. E. Peacock, Miss Mildred Rutherford.
Secretary, Mrs. B. F. Sutton.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. S. C. Moore, Macon.
Treasurer, Mrs. Flewellen Holt.
Chairman Press Committee, Mrs. Walter D. Lamar.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. Robert J. Taylor.

IOWA COMMITTEE

President, Mrs. Martin Flynn.
Secretary, Mrs. Simon Casady, 715 Prospect Road, Des Moines.

MARYLAND

Office: Garrett Building, German and South Streets, Baltimore.
President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Francis T. Redwood, Mrs. John Halsup Adams, Mrs. Arthur B. Kinsolving, Mrs. Michael Wild.
Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Talbot.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles B. Penrose.

MAINE

President, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Philip W. McIntyre, Mrs. David W. Snow.
Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand T. Wheeler.
Secretary, Mrs. George S. Hobbs, 48 Neal Street, Portland.

MASSACHUSETTS

Office: 687 Boylston Street, Boston, Room 615.
President, Mrs. James M. Codman.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Mary S. Ames, Mrs. George R. Agassiz, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Robert S. Russell.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman.
Recording Secretary, Miss Ellen Tower.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Boston.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. L. E. Clark, Mrs. C. A. Kent, Mrs. Charles W. Casgrain, Mrs. Joseph B. Schlotman.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Cosslett Smith.
Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William S. Jerome.

MINNESOTA

President, Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Walter Richardson, St. Paul; Mrs. Alfred Pillsbury, Minneapolis; Mrs. Edmund Pennington, Minneapolis; Mrs. E. C. Stringer, St. Paul.
Honorary President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight, St. Paul.
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. Daniel R. Noyes, St. Paul.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. W. W. Sykes, Minneapolis.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. L. Stevens, St. Paul.
General Secretary, Miss Rita Kelley, 331 Meyers Arcade, Minneapolis.
Executive Committee, Minneapolis, Mrs. J. S. Bell, Mrs. G. H. Christian, Mrs. H. C. Clarke, Mrs. H. Harcourt Horn, Mrs. L. K. Hull, Mrs. C. J. Martin, Mrs. J. H. MacMillan, Mrs. J. R. Marfield, Mrs. O. C. Wyman, Mrs. John Washburn, Mrs. C. C. Webber; St. Paul, Mrs. D. F. De Wolf, Miss Mary Davis, Miss Caroline Fairchild, Mrs. Emerson Hadley, Mrs. A. H. Lindeke, Mrs. J. E. Ricketts, Mrs. C. L. Spencer, Mrs. F. F. Wright.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Edson J. Hill, Concord; Mrs. Thomas C. Bethune, Concord; Mrs. Will B. Howe, Concord; Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Portsmouth; Mrs. John R. Spring, Nashua.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, 8 South State Street, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carry R. Todd.

NEBRASKA

President, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck.
Executive Committee, Mrs. Henry W. Yates, Mrs. John C. Cowin, Mrs. J. W. Griffith, Mrs. W. H. Koenig, Mrs. L. F. Crofoot, Mrs. Gerrit Fort, Mrs. John L. Webster, Mrs. Helen Arion Lewis, Mrs. Arthur Crittenden Smith, Mrs. T. J. Mackay, Mrs. F. N. Conner, Miss Janet M. Wallace.
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. Archibald Smith, 102 South 35th Street, Omaha.
Treasurer, Mrs. Frank J. Hoel, 110 South 34th Street.
Mrs. J. W. Crumpacker, Special Representative National Association, 536 Bee Building, Omaha.

NEW JERSEY

Office: 32 West State Street, Trenton.
Honorary President, Miss Dayton.
President, Mrs. E. Yarde Breese.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr., Mrs. Cornelius Hook, Mrs. Thomas Craven, Mrs. Garret A. Hobart, Mrs. John R. Emery, Mrs. William J. Libbey, Miss H. O. Magie, Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Miss Clara Vezin, Mrs. Karl G. Roebling, Mrs. William S. Stryker.
Treasurer, Mrs. George B. Yarde.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. R. C. Maxwell.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. A. E. Pendergast.
General Secretary, Mrs. Orville D. Oliphant.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 35 West 39th Street, New York.
President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Eleanor G. Hewitt, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs. George Douglas Miller, Mrs. William P. Northrup.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Secretary, Mrs. M. E. Loomis.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. N. C. Frick, Mrs. J. G. Gundersen, Mrs. E. B. Goss, Mrs. C. E. Wolf, Mrs. T. L. Beiseker, Mrs. L. B. Dochterman, Mrs. H. C. Chaffee, Mrs. R. H. Bosard, Miss M. O. Moyine, Mrs. J. W. Reynolds.
Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell, Fargo.
Executive Committee, Mrs. N. C. Young, Mrs. W. J. Howe, Mrs. D. B. Holt.

OHIO

President, Mrs. Harry E. Talbott, Dayton.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. W. Austin Goodman, Cincinnati; Mrs. Frank D. Jamison, Cincinnati; Mrs. Joseph A. Jeffrey, Columbus; Mrs. J. H. J. Upham, Columbus; Mrs. John Bradley Greene, Dayton; Mrs. Harry G. Carnell, Dayton; Mrs. Helen M. Lucas, Marietta; Mrs. J. Herbert Roach, Cleveland; Mrs. Charles Orr, Cleveland; Mrs. Milton James, Austin; Mrs. Cyrus Newby, Hillsboro; Miss Alice Bennett, Chillicothe.
Field Secretaries, Miss Lucy Price, Cleveland; Miss Clara Markeson, Columbus; Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarz, Cincinnati.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. MacMillan, 9 Dartmouth Drive, Dayton.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 261 South Fifteenth Street, Philadelphia.
President, Mrs. Horace Brock.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Miss Grace Falkner, Miss Sophy Dallas Irwin, Mrs. James Large, Mrs. John Markoe, Miss Mary Newhall.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Sloan.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Louise C. Hoppin, Mrs. Howard O. Sturges, Mrs. Stephen O. Metcalf.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Providence.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha H. Howard.
Newport Branch.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

VERMONT

President, Mrs. Clarence Morgan.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Edmund C. Mower, Mrs. Frank Parker.
Secretary, Mrs. Arthur Myrick.
Treasurer, Mrs. Walter Isham.
Chairman of Executive Board, Mrs. Humphrey.
Chairman Publicity Committee, Miss Lindsey.

VIRGINIA

President, Mrs. Frank D. Williams.
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. William F. Gray.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Hunsdom Cary, Mrs. Arthur P. Wilmer, Miss Annie Rose Walker, Mrs. James Lyons.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell, 1714 Grove Avenue, Richmond.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

1402 H Street, N. W.
President, Mrs. C. H. Davis.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Swager Sherley, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard, Mrs. Thomas T. Gaff.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. George G. Worthington.
Recording Secretary, Miss Elizabeth Davis.
Treasurer, Miss Alice Card.
Executive Committee, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard, Chairman; Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr.; Mrs. E. Rollins Morse, Mrs. George B. Puller, Mrs. Jessie Lincoln Beckwith, Mrs. Douglas Putnam Birnie, Miss Murray Ledyard, Miss Anne Squire, Miss Josephine Patten.
In Charge of Headquarters, Mrs. J. Alex Mahon.

WISCONSIN

President, Miss Mary L. Atwood.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Geo. H. Noyes.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. Frank L. Vance.
Secretary, Miss Gertrude S. Bean, 4 Prospect Avenue, Milwaukee.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ellis B. Usher.

THE LESSON OF THE LAST CHICAGO ELECTION

THE eyes of the country were on Chicago when, on April 6th, its 485,000 registered men and 282,000 registered women were entitled to vote in the mayoralty election. No one claimed to know the outcome. The uncertain element to most observers was the "woman vote," although the New York *Times* said, following the election:

"Apparently there was a preponderance of both men and women voters in favor of Thompson, who is popular in society, and it was evident weeks ago that the women inhabitants of Chicago would plump their votes solidly for him on election day. For weeks the women who own the little electric broughams, thousands of which can be seen in the streets of Chicago, have been adorning these vehicles with colored lithographs of Mr. Thompson."

One hundred and thirty-six thousand nine hundred and twenty women voted for Thompson, the Republican candidate, as against 86,629 for Sweitzer, the Democratic nominee. But the result would have been the same had no women voted. We quote a portion of an editorial in the New York *Evening Sun*, April 7th, which sums it up as follows:

"The vote of the women proved to be essentially insignificant. A great many women voted; but for all the effect they had on the result they might as well have stayed at home. Such small effect as can be traced in the most accurate figures now available was helpful to Thompson, but he didn't need any help. This was the way the vote stood:

	Thompson	Sweitzer	Plurality
Men	236,133	155,420	80,713
Women	136,920	86,629	50,291
Totals	373,053	242,049	131,004

"A little arithmetic will show that while Thompson's advantage in the men's vote was a trifle above one-fifth of the total, the figures for the women show a plurality considerably below one-fourth. On the combined vote the excess is about 21 per cent.

"Thus the result seems to support the view very generally held that votes for women will have no perceptible effect on elections except the increased expense and that all the results of the pending change will be of the reflex kind, the modifications in social relations due to the entrance of women into politics. But it is too soon as yet to feel sure of this."

An interesting side-light on the campaign is this quotation from the (Suffrage) Chicago *Tribune*: "The election was the culmination of the most intense and bitter campaign in Chicago's history. Injection of the religious question was the chief cause for the bitterness."

Since women had no real effect upon the election it will be interesting to see what effect the election and the campaign had upon women. The day after the election the New York *Times* said:

"A tour of various polling places to-day by the New York *Times* correspondent revealed the fact, however, that the chivalry on the part of the male election officials and political workers in the few elections held since women obtained the franchise in Illinois has worn off. Smoking in the polling places, which was tabooed last Fall out of respect to the women, was resumed in full force today."

The Chicago papers show a determination to avoid criticizing the Suffragists. Hence the following statement signed by Henry M. Hyde, presumably of the Chicago *Tribune* staff, is very pertinent and eminently trustworthy. It is reproduced from the April 7th issue of that newspaper, a Suffrage journal owned by a Suffrage leader.

In explaining his temerity, the writer says:

"Not the bravest man in Chicago would dare to criticize, no matter how mildly, any of the manifold manifestations of feminism. But perhaps a newspaper reporter may venture to set down some of the things he saw—particularly since he is planning to go out of town immediately."

His illuminating story is in part as follows (the italics are ours):

"She was a women approaching middle age, with touches of silver in her hair. She was well but not expensively dressed. Her face was gentle and there were soft lines in it which seemed to indicate a thoughtful mind. She was standing on the sidewalk in front of the Thompson headquarters on Randolph Street, close up to the building. In both hands she clutched a big megaphone.

"She was trying hard to make herself heard above the wild storm of sound, but the voice which came from the trumpet was neither shrill nor overloud. It sounded like a vastly exaggerated coo.

"'Everybody vote for Thompson. We want Big Bill! We want Big Bill!'

"The whole sidewalk for a block was swarming with a shifting, changing mass of yelling people, old and young of both sexes.

"Through it all the lady with the megaphone stood close to the building in front of the Thompson headquarters and bleated impotently through her huge mouthpiece. One had to be within two feet to distinguish the words.

"Men forcing their way through the jam stopped and looked at her and smiled. It was rather like seeing one's maiden aunt leaning up against the bar in a saloon.

"*She would not be worth notice but for the fact that during the week of irrational hysteria which preceded election day she was many times multiplied. She may stand as a type of a surprisingly large class.*

"*The first mayoralty campaign in which women voters participated somehow failed to develop the refining and elevating influence which the sex was expected to exert.*

"It was at the downtown meeting of a club organized and presided over by a woman that the nearest approach to a real riot broke out. And *women partisans took a leading part in the yelling, catcalling, and general disorder* which prevented either men or women speakers from making themselves heard from the stage.

"When one sees a woman of dignified presence and cultivated appearance greeted with torrents of hisses and insults from the frenzied lips of both men and other women, when one sees her finally driven from the platform with no chance of speaking a word, *one is tempted to retire to some quiet spot for a moment and meditate on what it all means.*

"When one watches a venerable lady, with snowy hair and gracious presence, trying to quell the tumult by waving a flag and almost dancing in the same rhythm, while 1,200 shrieking men and women order her to sit down and chase herself, one remembers his own grandmother and makes a feeble effort to blush.

"One is almost tempted to pick that discarded and discredited old relic once known as masculine chivalry out of the scrap heap and see how many people would recognize it.

"The first riot was at a Sweitzer meeting. By way of being entirely impartial it may be said that the next day exactly the same thing happened in the same place at a Thompson meeting.

"At the big political headquarters other things of somewhat the same complexion were to be seen. Masculine politicians were in supreme charge. But each had opened subsidiary headquarters for women voters.

"'Yes,' said one of the cynical male chiefs, 'we've got two headquarters for the ladies. We put them at opposite ends of the building because the two old girls we've got in charge of them would pull each other's hair out if they ever met.'"

The Woman's Protest
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by
The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City.

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover.....Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.

Vol. VI April, 1915 No. 6

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

There are even greater words than Liberty, Equality and Rights. Lacordaire, during the revolution in France, dared to say to his countrymen: "You have written upon the monuments of your city the words Liberty, Fraternity, Equality. Above Liberty write Duty, above Fraternity write Humility, above Equality write Service, above the immemorial creed of your Rights inscribe the divine creed of your Duties."

"MAKING AMENDS"

SEVERAL months ago Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, a speaker of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, brought suit against The Missoulian Publishing Company of Missoula, Mont., for the sum of $50,000, alleging criminal libel.

This suit marked the culmination of a series of attacks fostered by woman Suffragists against women opposed to suffrage, most of which were so adroitly phrased as to escape the penalty which the law imposes for defamation of character. These attacks are significant of what women must face if suffrage is foisted upon all women by the aggressive demands of a few Suffragists.

We therefore deem it well to show the exact nature of the attack upon which this suit was based.

The Daily Missoulian printed in its issue of October 12, 1914, the day upon which Mrs. Oliphant was to speak in Missoula, a poem headed, "To Mrs. O. D. Oliphant," from which the following verses are quoted:

"Who stands against its giving, though she be
But ignorant and selfish in her heart,
Joins hands, against her sisters in distress,
With brothel-keepers; plots with whiskey-mills
Against the mothers of the nation's sons.

"Upholds the modern Moloch, whose high-priests,
To satisfy their capitalistic greed,
Take children from their birthright of delight
To slavery, cruelty, terribly worse than death.

"Procurer's partner, whiskey-maker's tool,
Traitor to all the race holds just and good,
Foe to humanity and justice, she,
Who has betrayed her sisterhood for gold."

The suit was set for trial on April 8th, and Mrs. Oliphant and her witnesses had made all arrangements to set out for Missoula when the *Missoulian*, on March 31st, proposed to Mrs. Oliphant's attorneys to print the following public apology, editorially, under the heading "Making Amends."

"MAKING AMENDS"

"In the *Daily Missoulian* of October 12, 1914, there appeared a poem headed 'To Mrs. O. D. Oliphant,' in which an attempt was made to express the mothers' conception of the social significance of opposition to universal suffrage. Though entirely impersonal, the poem was addressed as it was because the prominent Missoula Suffragist whom Mrs. Oliphant (then campaigning in Montana against the proposed suffrage amendment) had publicly challenged to debate was out of the city, leaving the field open, and the *Missoulian* reporter wished to call Mrs. Oliphant's attention to the arguments of one, at least, of Missoula's pro-suffrage influences. Unfortunately, Mrs. Oliphant accepted as personal attacks portions of the poem attempting to point out the serious consequences of restraints upon women's use of the ballot. Nothing was farther than this from the author's or the paper's intent. That Mrs. Oliphant is sincere and above personal reproach the *Missoulian* believes, since it knows (and then knew) nothing more concerning her than the fact that she is a prominent Anti-Suffragist and a woman of high personal character. The *Missoulian* is sorry that Mrs. Oliphant accepted the poem as a personal attack, since it knows of nothing improper that could be said of her personally, and since it aims to keep above mere personal attacks. If any of its readers have shared Mrs. Oliphant's impression, the *Missoulian* and the author of the poem take this means of correcting such impression."

To avoid the distress and strain of a public trial, Mrs. Oliphant accepted this apology. The editorial was printed in the *Missoulian* of April 3d and the action has been dismissed.

"WHEN WOMEN UNDERBID MEN"

WHEN women underbid men in the labor markets of the world, oppose them in their political ambitions, use their sex equipment of weakness, or charm, or what not, as a weapon in the struggle for existence, then there may be bred a real sex antagonism, which will be crushed out eventually by the stronger sex, brutally and easily, simply by virtue of their strength. This will be a very different thing from the present emotional variety of sex antagonism arising from the false view of life and the loss of a sense of proportion. This change has put mere sex into an abnormal and even ridiculous prominence, holding it so close to the eye that it blots out every other idea or thought. When we put it back where it belongs and give it only its due we shall find all antagonism will disappear except that normal kind which really promotes interest, an "antagonism" of which the other side of the shield is "attraction."

Perhaps this will come about quietly by evolution, with the dying down of the present phase of radicalism as evidenced by suffrage, feminism, etc. Or perhaps it can only come about through a revolution in which a brutal commercial crushing by the stronger sex shall restore the balance to its normal equilibrium.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE TIMES

IT has been publicly stated by Suffragists that on account of the adverse criticisms of the editorial in the New York *Times* opposing woman suffrage, that paper intends to change its policy on the subject. We are authorized to announce that there is absolutely no truth in this statement.

FEMINISM A RETURN TO BARBARISM

By Mrs. John B. Heron

Vice-President, National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

ONE of the most interesting triangular commentaries on the suffrage situation was made last week by three New York editors, whose views were extensively reproduced in exchanges throughout the country. Only one of these editors had anything optimistic to say about "votes for women"—and he was what we may term a progressive Anti-Suffragist. One of the other editors illustrated in detail how the women's votes had failed to do any good in Chicago, and quoted the Suffragists as showing that "no change, no purification or elevation or idealization or poetization of politics is to be expected from woman suffrage," but weakly concluded that merely "to please some of the women" the feminine ballot "is to be adopted."

The other editor frankly came out for suffrage, on the astonishing plea that the Suffragists "have maintained at times a reign of terror over legislative bodies, in consequence of which half the country is now bedeviled by some form or other of harem government," and legislators are "forever making ridiculous concessions to women agitators on the theory that official sympathy with such moral yearnings is a shrewd method of diverting public suspicion." In other words, this editor desires woman suffrage for the very reason that ought to make him work most enthusiastically against it—he would cure the disease of suffrage agitation by forcing all women to submit to the innoculation of the ballot.

It is a rather queer proposal, on a parallel with one in which someone might advocate drafting the whole population into a standing army in order to keep a few anarchists from "maintaining a reign of terror." Again, we notice, that this editor confesses that the women, or "some women" seem to exert more "bedevilment" by indirect influence without the ballot than he believes they would if all women were given the vote. This is at once an admission of one of the main "Anti" arguments—namely, that women actually accomplish more in proportion to their numbers, without than with the ballot. But this does not only mean for the few, but for all women. In order to keep the few feminists from abusing their privileges as women which society and custom have given them, this editor would reduce all women to the level of equality with men—put them where the men could count them at every election, and figure out just how little they need pay attention to the good or the bad. There is no doubt that this view is much more common than either Suffragists or Anti-Suffragists realize. Many men, especially among the politicians, are anxious to learn in numbers and parties just what women want, so that no question may enter into its gift or refusal but the practical one of how many votes are behind it. As the "Antis" have contended all along, feminism would be the most convenient thing for men that has recently been retrieved from a state of development that civilization outgrew long ago. The men are growing restive under the constant charges of oppression and tyranny the Suffragists are always harping upon; having been inspired by poetry, love, romance and religion to regard woman as a superior being, the modern man is now coming to the point where he is beginning to doubt the divinity of the woman who was raised from the drudgery of the camp-fire and wigwam to the exaltation of the Christian altar. And Suffragists are helping him to forget that less than a thousand years ago most of the civilized nations of to-day treated women as the Indian treated his squaw.

But the women, even though drudges, were really better off with our barbarian ancestors than they would be if given the utter "freedom" and "equality" the feminists either openly avow or unconsciously further. There is only one way in which it is physically possible to make the mother "equal" to the father in relation to their common child—let the State, instead of the husband become responsible for its support when natural functions render the mother unable to engage in any money-earning occupation. And this, of course, means not only State Socialism, but the corresponding abolition of all motives on the part of the man for monogamous marriage, which, from a biological standpoint, is a racial rather than a romantic institution. Even the savage, who kept his wife in subjugation, at least was careful to see that she was provided with food and shelter to the extent that he could command, for their children's sake—but with all this new-fangled nonsense that ridicules "home and mother" and continually indicts father as a tyrant, the Suffragists are liable to force their sex to accept, whether they want it or not, the "ultimate goal of feminism" that some think they would like to live under.

The New York editor who wants to penalize all women with the ballot, in order to keep the Suffragists from "scaring" the timid male politicians by their "indirect influence," indicates very significantly a trend in masculine thought toward making all women suffer the burden that a very small proportion pretend to be anxious to take up. It is the old story, you cannot ask for additional rights, without assuming additional duties, and here we see the proposal advanced to make all women perform another duty—which no one now contends will benefit herself, the State or the race—simply because some women are demanding the vote as a right.

The disposition of men to give women what they want is proverbial—and feminism in full blast would be here within a dozen years if the men were convinced that the women wanted it. The man is not absolutely either a marrying or a moral animal, and would profit by "freedom" much more than women would. To him "votes for women" means little, and is usually regarded as more or less of a joke. Realizing that he can either outwit or outnumber woman in politics—or even fall back on his physical supremacy, if need be—to keep her from taking anything he is unwilling to give her, the man who has not thought much on the subject is perfectly willing to let the woman take up the vote, or anything else she wants, because he knows that the more "independent" she is, the less both she and society will expect of him. And if an editor can advocate giving the women the vote merely to save a few politicians the annoyance of listening to the suffrage agitation, does it now show the lengths the men might go after the ballot had started its work as the outpost of feminism?

The logical division in men's and women's work is drawn more precisely at the point of politics than anywhere else. It is a man's game, as much as the care of babies is a womanly occupation. It is not that she is not "intelligent" enough to vote, but that she has a higher destiny, that is inconsistent with her devoting to politics the time and energy she needs to further progress. Practically everything women have accomplished in the march of progress has been by their "indirect," uncounted, non-partizan, social and moral "influence," and the point should be noted that it is this that some men are ready to make all women give up because some have protested a preference for the plunge into politics. It is a question of exchanging an exalted place in the formation of public opinion for a partizanship in politics, as most women realize.

Many of the men seem unable to understand why the women themselves should oppose the ballot for their sex—but this, briefly, is one of the compelling reasons: because woman feels and knows

that she would lose her best opportunities to benefit her sisters and herself, and to maintain the high respect and enjoy the service and support of men, if she sacrifices her woman's power—and charm—for an inconsequential vote. Women cannot consistently ask for a place in men's political race and then insist that they be helped over all the hurdles because they are naturally handicapped in the contest by their sex and their mission as mothers.

Woman needs man as a friend, not as a competitor.

In every normal civilized State the woman becomes relieved more and more of the hard work and drudgery—in order to have time for the cultivation and inspiration of those things that make a nation great. It is only in a state of decadence, such as the Romans were in at the time Cato made his wonderful and effective argument against woman suffrage and women in politics, that some women—almost exclusively of the "leisure class"—find woman's sphere too dull and desire to usurp the places of men. But the people's instincts, and especially the judgment of the vast majority of women, on this question are right. And the record proves that the more the people themselves learn about feminism the more overwhelmingly do they reject it, with all it means.

For instance, it was forty-five years before woman suffrage became established in eleven sparsely settled States, with over fifteen thousand fewer women than live in Pennsylvania alone. And the average majority that caused all these States to adopt woman suffrage was but 8,750 votes per State. That is, a majority of 96,285 votes were secured for suffrage in all these eleven States; they won from 1869 to 1914. But from 1898 to 1914 eleven States with over three times the population of the suffrage States overwhelmingly rejected votes for women at the polls by an average majority of over 58,000 votes per State; while four of the States that defeated suffrage—Wisconsin, Ohio, Michigan and Missouri—averaged a majority of over 105,000 each against it, or more than the combined majorities for all the suffrage States.

But if we look at the thing as from 1912, we find that Nevada and Montana, with a combined population of one hundred thousand less than the city of Pittsburgh, and with the smallest percentages of women to men in the United States, were the only States to grant suffrage. On the other hand, since November 2, 1914, we find that another eleven States have rejected woman suffrage—five at the polls, which are included in the previous summary and six within the last six weeks in their Legislatures. It is true that, on the other hand, four great Eastern States—New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Massachusetts—have allowed the Suffragists a chance to submit the question to the voters in these States this year, but if the Suffragists themselves had had any hopes of carrying these States they would not have spent $30,000, as they confessed, in trying to get Congress to pass a National amendment on January 12, 1915—where they were also defeated.

But there is yet danger from the indifferent vote which must be shown its responsibility to the majority of women who do not desire the ballot. With these four States held against feminism this year, the suffrage agitation will become as important as the Presidential aspirations of two once-popular candidates—and suffrage will become a danger of the past, which the people have been wise enough to discover and prevent.

COLD LOGIC APPLIED TO "INALIENABLE RIGHTS"

TO the Editor of the Public Ledger:

Sir—In an editorial in the *Public Ledger* of March 23 you assume that women have the same inherent, inalienable rights as men. You say that equal franchise rests its claim upon this assumption; you assert that the franchise is not the concession of a privilege, but the exercise of a right that is inseparable from citizenship.

With your assumption that women have the same inherent rights as men every one will be in accord, but that woman suffrage rests its claim upon this assumption does not make the claim valid. Life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness—these are inherent rights; to these women, as well as men, have an inalienable right. The franchise is not an inherent right; it is a governmental expedient. Pushed to its logical extreme, the doctrine that the suffrage is an inherent right would give the vote to the Indian and the defective; it could not be refused to the Chinese and the Japanese resident among us. They, too, have inherent rights.

Nor does citizenship rest upon the exercise of the franchise. The fact that I do not possess a vote in no way affects my status as a citizen or my right to the protection my country affords or should afford to its citizens. Do you deny to my kinswoman in Paris at the present time the right to say, "I am an American citizen," because she does not vote? To my friends in Serbia and Russia the rights to whatever protection their country's flag may afford because they do not vote? The franchise is a governmental expedient, not an inherent right nor an indispensable qualification of citizenship.

The question to be decided by the voters next autumn must not rest on irrelevant assumptions nor on arguments drawn from alien conditions. It must be clearly and sharply defined. Women may vote in Finland, may be under legal disqualification in England, may have become aware of themselves in the Latin countries. These are interesting facts, but they have slight bearing on the question at issue here.

Is it expedient in this country, in this State, at this time, to extend the suffrage to a large new class of voters, indiscriminated by any qualification other than of sex? This is the vital question. Popular government on the vast scale on which it is being tried in this country is still experimental. This is the fundamental assumption. If we are to fulfil our trust to the future, any measure involving so sweeping a change as the doubling of the electorate must fully justify itself; it must be considered primarily as a measure of public polity, with reference to its value and the price we must pay for it, and only secondarily as a piece of class legislation should we consider the advantage or disadvantage the possession of the franchise would be to the possible voter.

It is not my intention to make this communication controversial, but merely to state the question as it presents itself to women like myself, who belong neither to the Anti-Suffragist nor to the Suffragist Association, but are simply among the number of those people of whom Abraham Lincoln said, God must love them because He made so many of them.

Three chief lines of thinking are suggested by your editorial. First, that women who are property holders are under disqualification without the vote. I have been a property holder and taxpayer for years, and the fact that I have no vote has never placed me at a disadvantage. My property has received the protection of the State, and has been subject to no discrimination in the amount of tax paid for that protection. The State, in the large sense of the word, takes cognizance simply of the fact of ownership, not of the individuality of the owner. My financial agent, who has a vote, is subject to inconvenience, annoyance and finan-

cial loss at present, because, by the exercise of the right of eminent domain, the State can by law do what no individual would be permitted to do.

You say that the world has been governed badly as it has been governed by men. If we have not achieved Utopia, may it not be that, though nearly 2,000 years have gone by since ordered living, justice in the relations between man and man as the highest altruism, were set before us as an ideal, yet mankind, struggling, failing, triumphing, has gone but a little way toward the goal of perfection, for the march of humanity is slow. A century ago we wrested democracy from the grasp of the ages. We declared that men are born free and equal, and we believed that the State could confer upon them the charter of their liberties. We have not yet won freedom. We are to-day far from political salvation. The price we pay for popular government is that it is a government by compromise, through many mistakes, through many failures. Let us beware that the price we pay is not too great.

You assure us that "there are profound reasons for believing that the enfranchisement of women will bring a new and truer sense of civic responsibility * * * to the Commonwealth." Will you tell us what they are? In the struggle of life it is the individual that counts. There are undeniably women "in the possession of every qualification for sharing the responsibilities of government possessed by men," but the question to be decided upon next autumn is not as to the qualification of every woman for voting, but the effect of the universal enfranchisement of women. Every law of probability leads one to the conclusion that the irresponsible, the illiterate, the venal, the absentee vote would outnumber that of the "saving remnant." Illinois gave the vote to Jane Addams, but it also gave it to Mrs. Blazi, who secured the registration of 500 women, and is said to have delivered 300 votes for "Bathhouse John" Coghlin. Human nature is human nature in women as in men. * * *

But the ultimate argument, you say, is that women have a right to the franchise. Upon what is their right based? The franchise is a measure of governmental policy; it is not an inherent right, it has not been conferred upon women by law, therefore they have no claim to it as a legal right. Two associations formed for the purpose of furthering the agitation for the immediate universal enfranchisement of women have qualified their title by the term "equal"; "the Equal Franchise Society" and the "National College Equal Franchise Association," assuming thereby, apparently as a logical conclusion, that because men vote, women should vote. But implicit in the name is a fallacy. The logic breaks down on close scrutiny.

Manhood suffrage has been granted by the Government; it exists as a fact to be examined critically; its existence cannot be regarded as a conclusive argument for the extension of the franchise, or indeed in any sense an argument.

We owe our present freedom not only to "the faith of the founders of the Republic" in popular government, but to their sagacity in instituting checks upon the expression of the popular will. We owe the conservatism that has marked the political evolution of the country to our constitutionalism, to our veneration for the political ideas of the statesmen who molded the Republic, who gave form to the democratic ideal. Some time during last winter an after-dinner speaker said in the course of his remarks that the Constitution is at present undergoing repair. He was promptly rebuked; but there was truth in the suggestion that at first seemed startling in its irreverence. To-day for the first time we are arraigning the wisdom of the framers of the Constitution, we are asking for new definitions of its principles. They believed in a representative government, we are discussing the referendum. They believed in the threefold division into the executive, the legislative and the judicial departments; yet the executive both in the National and the State governments is assuming more and more initiative, using the power placed in the hands of this branch of government to enforce, if possible, the acceptance of executive measures. They believed in the stability of the tenure and the independence of the judiciary. To-day the recall of judicial decisions is legal in one State. Jefferson believed that least governed was best governed. To-day the undisciplined will of the people has become tyrannical. Mr. Root in his address at the Union League defined a position already generally recognized. If the sagacity of the statesmen who gave form and substance to the democratic ideal is challenged, so also must the ground of their faith in the capacity of the people for self-government be examined and manhood suffrage must be brought to the bar. The independence of the judiciary was no more hardly won than manhood suffrage. Representative government is as essential a measure of governmental policy as the popular vote.

The conditions under which manhood suffrage was instituted in 1787 and extended in 1865 differ wholly from the political conditions of to-day. If the founders of the republic had foreseen that America would be the melting pot of the nations they would have held their hands. If they had foreknown the light esteem in which the ballot would be held, the persistent vacating of the franchise, the nominal penalty for fraudulent voting, even for fraudulent citizenship, they would have instituted qualifications. If the men of 1865 who gave the franchise to the colored race had foreseen the long years that must elapse before the devoted men and women who form the vanguard of that race could lead their people into a freedom the ballot could not give, they, too, would have held their hands. If now an amendment is passed almost doubling the present electorate by adding a large new class of voters whose sole common qualification is that of sex, future generations will call it a colossal mistake.

When the smoke of discussion has cleared away, the issue of the moment will reveal itself to be, not the extension of the franchise, but its limitation; first, by an amendment which, while giving the safeguards of citizenship to the incoming emigrant, will withhold the franchise until through a greater length of residence than that required for citizenship, and the fulfilment of a more rigid test than that now required, signed evidence will be given of the ability to exercise the franchise intelligently and independently. An article by one of the *Public Ledger* staff called attention not long ago to the comment of that astute observer, Guglielmo Ferrero, on the ready acceptance of the still foreign emigrant as a voter by the United States, and the element of weakness therein, and compared it with the conservative policy of the South American Republics.

Second, by a provision which shall penalize by disfranchisement the persistent vacating of the franchise, disqualifying the voter who, while availing himself of the safeguards of citizenship, shall neglect the primary duty of voting. Not in one, but in several, editorials has the *Public Ledger* recognized the perils of the absentee vote and suggested the imposition of a penalty.

When the cloud of words that obscure the issue is lifted the large influence which the new attitude of the State toward common school education will have in the political evolution of the republic will be recognized. It has made it compulsory; it is awakening to the fact that, in spite of labors of educators, in spite of admirable service of many devoted teachers, the present common school education is inadequate for the training of its citizens. To-day, out of 700,000 children of foreign parents, 110,000 between the ages of 6 and 14 are not attending school; and not until the automatic establishment of an educational qualification for the vote has been recognized and the standard has been defined by the Commonwealth will the people be justified in considering the extension of the electorate.

Women have neither an inherent nor a legal right to the franchise. Their immediate universal enfranchisement in this country, in this State, is inexpedient. We ask the votes of the Commonwealth to defeat the measure proposing it.

Bryn Mawr, Pa., April 1, 1915. W.

SUFFRAGE IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

(*From Boston Post, March* 31, 1915)

WOMAN suffrage has proved such a failure in the State of Washington that thousands of those who helped to adopt it four years ago would to-day gladly vote for a return to male suffrage if given the opportunity, according to Judge W. H. Snell of Tacoma, who is staying at the Beaconsfield, Brookline, with his wife and family.

In an interview yesterday, Judge Snell said:

"I favored woman suffrage in Washington and voted for it. But in common with thousands of others who looked at the question as an abstract proposition, and hoped for the best, I am so greatly disappointed at the way it has worked out that I would to-day welcome an opportunity to vote for its withdrawal; and I believe if it were resubmitted to the people of Washington, and every man and woman of voting age were compelled to vote upon it, woman suffrage would be defeated by an overwhelming majority.

"Many of us were led to support woman suffrage in Washington by the familiar argument that it would tend to purify politics and make for better government. But, after four years of experience, we are forced to conclude that it has done neither. On the contrary, it has simply added to the numbers of those who can be used in the interest of corrupt politics, and has resulted in a hodge-podge of ill-digested, sentimental, socialistic legislation, which is a menace to the welfare of the State.

"The Suffragist theory is that women are as much entitled to the ballot as men, but however this may be considered in the abstract, I am now convinced that we should have done much better for the State of Washington if, instead of extending the franchise to women, we had adopted a more restrictive franchise for men.

"It is unquestionably true that many men have the privilege of the franchise who are clearly unfit to exercise it. This, however, as we have learned to our cost in Washington, is no reason for extending the suffrage to women. When we gave women the vote we enfranchised the wife and daughter who were no more fit to cast the ballot than the unfit husband and father from whom the ballot should have been taken away. In other words, we simply added one wrong to another and called it a right.

"In Washington we have found that the same motives which control men in their exercise of the franchise also control women. Women are hired to do political work at so much per day, just as men are hired, except that women work cheaper. Women are acuated in their use of the ballot by the same selfish motives as men, and they look forward to securing political 'plums' for themselves or relatives in return for their political influence, just as men do—and they get their reward, too.

"Our experience with woman suffrage in Washington is that women divide on public questions just as men divide, and when I say public questions I mean to include moral questions. And they are at least as inconsistent and vacillating in their judgments as men. In Seattle the women tied up with the ministers and secured the recall of Hy Gill; and then, when he became a candidate for the same office at the next election women gave him their hearty support and elected him.

"In Tacoma the women tied up with the saloon element and secured the recall of Mayor Fawcett, and then when he became a candidate for re-election they worked and voted for him and he was returned.

"And just as in the case of men, there is an element among the women of Washington who do make a business of politics. And by business I mean mercenary and selfish business. They form political organizations, pass resolutions and present petitions for legislation, presuming to represent the women of the State, when as a matter of fact they are only a few busybodies who represent but a small faction of the women of the State."

SOME PHASES OF THE PRESENT "HYSTERICAL" AGE

By Mrs. Albert T. Leatherbee

FUTURE generations will undoubtedly classify the period in which we are now living as "the hysterical age." It is the time of emotional frenzy, due to overstimulation, and we suffer from too much speed, moving with an abnormal velocity which is fast making us a race of neurotics.

We are developing our emotions at the expense of our physical and mental welfare. Our every-day life demonstrates this tendency—the books we read, the plays we see, the music we hear and the games we play all prove it. But nowhere is it more plainly shown than in the present unrest of the modern woman. Whether in work or play she is eternally catering to her emotions and constantly seeking new sensations.

No longer content with such emotions as may be derived from social and business life, she has entered the political field—that arena which gives full play to high-keyed existence. The suffrage agitation attracts many as affording those emotional sensations which are supplied nowhere else in such quantity and continual variation.

The suffrage propaganda fairly shrieks with emotional activity, verging upon hysteria, and is based upon causes which lie within the realm of pathological research. The great majority of its exponents endeavor to gain their end by playing upon the emotions, rather than the intelligence of their audiences by the use of sentimental interpretations and expositions of perfectly natural conditions. Every ill known to human society is classed as due to the lack of female franchise and is seized upon as an argument for "votes for women."

There is no condition of private life or public affairs that is not paraded in sentimental garb for furthering the cause. The natural functions of parenthood and domestic life are hauled into the limelight for exploitation. The so-called "social evil" is dug out and displayed in detail with gusto. Even the frightful European conflict is declared an argument for "votes for women."

Peace parties are formed to assist the propaganda and the causes of war, deep-lying though they be in the very instincts of animal life, are entirely overlooked and the subject swamped in sentimental twaddle.

The whole country is being swept by a great wave of epidemic emotion, not unlike those of previous ages when dancing madness and hypnotic madness had their course. But just as these have passed into oblivion, so will this present frenzy vanish, and society will return to sanity. Future generations will look back in pity and contempt at our present affliction as we do on those epidemic nervous disorders of the former ages.

Now is the time for sanity and common-sense to come to the front and assert themselves in an earnest endeavor to shorten this period of emotional abnormality, and thus aid society to return to a natural and healthy state of mind; and the first step in the right direction is to successfully ***oppose the further extension of suffrage to women!***

"WHAT ARE THE VERY LATEST SUFFRAGE ARGUMENTS?"

By Miss Eliza D. Armstrong

Registrar, Pittsburgh Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

"WE have all heard about women as 'peepul,' 'taxation without representation,' etc., from the suffragists," said a woman to the writer the other day. "They have been talking that as long as I can remember, but just what are the very latest suffrage arguments? I haven't been keeping track of them so well as you active 'antis' do."

Well, we have noticed three remarkable suffrage arguments put out last week, and here they are:

First. The editor of a well-known newspaper editorially endorsed woman suffrage under the assumption that women, as well as men, have "an inherent, inalienable right to the ballot"—just after the election commissioners of his own city had announced that 40,000 men had lost their "inalienable right" to vote by moving since November! And this, too, in spite of the fact that the official suffrage blue book declares in big, bold-faced type that "Suffrage Is Not a Natural Right," that the Supreme Court decided over thirty years ago on this point that voting is a privilege instead of an inherent right, and that an article contributed by one of the pioneer suffragists to the Cyclopedia of American Government, contains the following quotation:

"The right of suffrage may be regulated, modified, or withdrawn by the authority which conferred it. It is not a natural right of which a person cannot be deprived, but a privilege which may be granted or denied by the people or by the department of Government to which they have delegated power in the matter, as general policy may require."

Perhaps you believe it is ridiculous to point out this at this time, but in view of the fact that the official heads of nearly all the suffrage associations of Pennsylvania have publicly thanked this editor for his "new" argument for woman suffrage within a week, we see how this age-old fallacy must be refuted again. It seems that it would be almost impossible for anyone to acknowledge the State's right to determine the age, residence and educational qualifications of voters, without admitting that the elective franchise is a question of public policy, to be determined for the common good, instead of according to academic allegations of private rights—and yet the Suffragists, powerless to produce one good reason for woman suffrage from its record of 45 years' practise in Wyoming, 22 in Colorado, 19 years in Idaho and Utah, are constrained to fall back upon the fallacies of 1848 to plead for woman suffrage in 1915!

But this is by no means all. The second "new" argument is worse than the first, "and the worst is yet to come," we presume. The same editorial contains the astonishing assertion that men have done about as bad as could be done, that Pennsylvania, for instance, "couldn't be any worse," and this sentiment, too, found its ready echo in the columns of the leading suffrage exponent of this State. (Antis do not make a practise of holding Suffragists responsible for their sophistries by names—but we always have them, to produce if necessary, but we try to be charitable enough not to publicly criticize individuals—we're fighting feminism, not names or persons.)

But just think of anyone's coming out with a plea for the most radical experiment ever put up to our people on the grounds that our country or State is as badly managed as it can be! Hasn't the anarchist, the Socialist, the Mormon or the atheist as good a right to advance such a specious argument? "Couldn't be any worse," when Colorado, heretofore the "model suffrage State," with nearly a year of Federal intervention to preserve lives and property after women and children were shot down at Ludlow last summer—for which one militia official was "reduced five files in rank," and the judge of its Juvenile Court declaring only last Sunday that he would "resort to a revolver" if the law would not protect him from his enemies—is a graphic example of just how much worse off we might be than we are. Where is the patriotism, the State pride, the respect for our Commonwealth's achievements in persons who can advance such arguments? Pennsylvania, with the best Mothers' Pension Legislation in the Union, spending more for needy citizens than any other State, and yet the only State in the country out of debt, must submit to these indictments merely because a few women, backed by a few feminine men, want to try out a new theory here, instead of spending the carfare to the Missouri that would give them all they want of "votes for women."

Are we to give Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts and New Jersey double suffrage merely to reproduce the conditions in Colorado which furnished Judge Lindsey with material for "The Beast?" Not if I know anything about the men and women of this grand old State of which we have reason to be proud. It is just such silly indictments of their own native State that gives the muckrakers material on which to build up national articles holding a commonwealth up to the scorn of the country by quoting the sayings of such persons.

Pennsylvania is not perfect—but we invite comparisons with Colorado, for instance, with its riot record of calling for Federal troops twice in ten years to take the place of an effeminate State government; with one of its legislators elected under the "purified politics" of "votes for women" only recently dismissed for perjury—or with any of the other suffrage States you desire to name.

It has just been announced that it cost New York over four million dollars on its last election, over half of which was paid by the taxpayers. And one of the greatest items of expense to the taxpayers was maintenance of clerical forces, polling places, printing bills, etc., all of which would need to be readjusted, multiplied and nearly doubled if women had the vote. With Colorado—where United States troops were required to protect life and property—under the highest per capita tax in the country, do we want to indulge in an experiment that will cost us millions every year, impose a higher tax on our people, and increase the high cost of living, merely to see if it is possible to make our State any worse? A great deal of the high cost of living now is due to the fact that market baskets and the old-fashioned purchases by the barrel and bushel are "out of date"—the "modern woman" demands her supplies done up in packages, ordered by telephone, and delivered by piecemeal. And with women withdrawn still more from the wifely duties and efficient home management our mothers practised better than we—where will the cost of living and of government stop?

But listen to the third "new" suffrage plea: "Give them the vote. Women are queens now, let's make them equals," says a New Yorker. "We know more about politics than they do, and we can pound them to pieces and submission better with the ballot than without it." That is how the Suffragists are making some men feel. Is it a good sign?

"THE CALL OF THE NEW LADY"

By Emma G. Sebring

This paper by Miss Sebring was read at the twenty-fifth anniversary of her class at Smith College and printed by vote of the class in the *Smith Alumnæ Quarterly*, from which it is reproduced. Miss Sebring is headmistress of St. Agatha School in New York and a leader in the Headmistresses Association.

IS there not for us college women one final, ultimate goal to which all roads lead, like Rome of old, one supreme, universal call to service which neither opposes nor hinders individual calls and callings, but unifies all in the guidance of a common ideal, a common inspiration? I ask you to consider the call of this ideal—of the ideal of dignity and nobility and beauty of personality—as the highest expression of individual worth and the finest instrument of social service.

We have, of late, been in the midst of a lively controversy concerning the comparative merits of cultural versus vocational training. Without taking sides with either party in the argument, I venture to suggest the need of culture as a vocation for the college woman. I submit the proposition that greatly as the economic world needs trained workers, and manifestly as the workers in this field need training, even more intensely does society at large need intelligent gentlewomen, who shall become missionaries of culture, using that word in its highest and broadest sense to include not only training of intellect and of knowledge, but also, and far more, training of heart and refinement of feeling, manifested in beauty of taste, in fineness of breeding, in grace of character, in nobility of conduct. Whether or not the woman's college shape its curriculum to meet economic as well as intellectual needs, it must ever remain the guardian of ideals, the treasure house of those spiritual forces which illuminate life and vitalize and redeem society.

This is called woman's age. Whatever the expression may mean, and probably few would agree upon its significance, all would agree that the center of woman's interest and activity has vastly changed during the last half-century, in part from choice, in part from necessity, in part from the drift of circumstances. Among the many directions in which the woman of to-day is moving, there are three which must arrest attention.

First, liberated by enlargement of opportunity from the narrow sphere to which custom formerly restricted her, she seems, in the intoxication of freedom, to be sweeping away all barriers which aforetime hemmed her in, to be trying her powers in every kind of endeavor, to be turning the whole world into a laboratory of sex experiment.

Secondly, forced by the economic needs of sweeping industrial changes from the shelter of the home into the mart of the wage-earner, she is there jostled and crowded and stripped of sex-prestige by the pressure of an undiscriminating competition, and often ground under the heel of an unrestrained greed for money.

And thirdly, through the uneven operation of these same economic forces which have produced extremes of poverty and of wealth, she has been exalted to a position of great riches, of luxurious ease, of benumbing affluence, which have proved blighting in their influence.

The agitator, the toiler, the parasite, form three conspicuous types among the women of the day, the product, in large part, of two equally conspicuous trends, the woman movement and the new industrialism. Consider for a moment these two movements.

Within the memory of my own generation arose the insistent and concerted demand for an education for women equal to that for men. Women's colleges were founded, and despite the vociferous protests of a loud-voiced conservatism, women's colleges increased in number and in numbers. Intellectual cravings begot professional ones, and the men's medical schools and other technical institutions were besieged and captured by women applicants, undaunted by the uproar of protesting scepticism and cynicism. In close company with these intellectual and professional aspirations, or indeed, part and parcel of them, came visions of political enfranchisement, yearnings to participate in the arena of politics, to share equally with man in civic privilege and responsibility. The movement, gaining headway, has surged forward with increasing momentum and wide-spreading enlistment, until now it includes under its banner every phase of woman's suffragism, from the mildest and most conservative doctrine of civic rights and of civic needs to the most aggressive form of militantism and the most extreme propagandism of philosophical feminism.

Distinct in origin yet related in development, the new industrialism has concomitantly with the woman's movement wrought radical social changes directly affecting woman and her relations to society. The great scientific discoveries and mechanical inventions of the age in their application to industry together with its closer and more powerful organization have transferred woman as worker from the home to the factory. Her entry in large numbers into the field of men's labors has helped to depress men's wages and thereby has forced her in still larger numbers into the ranks of the wage-earner. From the homemaker and domestic partner of man she has become his competitor, and through the stress of economic forces beyond her resistance has helped to emphasize an opposition of the sexes. Further, as toiler in shop and factory, contributing under oppressive conditions to the wealth of others, in the defencelessness of her position she has become a victim of selfish greed, whetting the appetite of which she is the prey. Thus as exploited worker, she figures as a complicating factor in the social situation and a depressing influence upon standards as well as upon wages.

And again, through the rapid development of industry and the vast increase of profits, she has drifted from a position of dignified work and responsibility in the conduct of the home to one of dangerous idleness and irresponsibility. For the enormous wealth of the modern commercial over-lord, prodigally lavished upon his womenfolk, has led those of frivolous mind, selfish heart, and foolish ambition to lead voluptuous lives in the lime-light of publicity.

Without attempting to consider the merits or demerits of the woman's movement, without entering into the argument of woman's suffrage or of feminism in any of their aspects, without offering any solution of the complicated problem of modern industrialism, all of which is wide of the present discussion, I ask you to consider certain by-products of these two great movements and their challenge to the educated woman who recognizes her social responsibility.

First and notably among present social phenomena is an exaggerated and unwholesome sex-consciousness, manifesting itself in various guises. The literature of the day makes constant use of the sex-motive, the stage and the "movies" exploit it, the

press abounds in accounts and discussions of sex situations and sex problems, science, education, and religion are absorbingly interested in sex hygiene. Fashion has done its utmost to make woman conspicuous and sexually alluring; extreme and suggestive styles of dress, startling coiffures, a widespread, lavish use of cosmetics, are matters of common observation. The presence of women seems to be the most obtrusive fact in modern society. The old-fashioned virtue of modesty has been dangerously supplanted by an aggressive sex-assertion, an intolerance of restraint, a wanton spirit of license.

In close company with this abnormal sex-consciousness is a marked and equally deplorable sex-antagonism, in part explicit in expression, in part an undercurrent of feeling, coloring the viewpoint. In the tactics of the aggressive Suffragist, abuse of man is a weapon of attack, a club for beating opponents into submission. In milder forms, in both sexes, antagonism shows itself in press, on platform, and in daily intercourse in expressions of narrow prejudice, of carping cynicism, of petty criticism, of mutual distrust. In all forms, whether open and avowed or implicit and subtle, sex-antagonism is destructive of the finest moral and social development, for distrust and dishonor are dwarfing and stunting in their effect. Only under the tonic influence of mutual respect, good will, strong faith, can there flourish those high ideals of manhood and of womanhood which must ever remain the inspiration of the race.

And thirdly, while modern science and modern industry have increased wealth and greatly added to the comforts, conveniences, and luxuries of life, they have also brought startling changes in social standards. A materialism more or less crass grips society; success and possessions, not personal worth, are the generally accepted measure of a man. Extravagance, pleasure, excitement, speed, noise, rush, too largely characterize the life of the day. Manners are almost a lost art; taste and propriety in conduct as in dress have too largely disappeared. Voices are loud as well as costumes; time and strength as well as money are prodigally spent in a feverish round of pleasure and excitement.

As the agitator, the toiler, the parasite are products, in part at least, of the woman's movement and of the new industrialism, so are the phenomena described in part by-products of these two movements. They are not offered as the most characteristic features of the life of the day—such pessimism would be unwarranted—nor are they submitted as the result of a complete analysis of the complicated social situation; but they are presented as significant of dangerous tendencies and of pressing needs. Modern industry under the lead of scientific management has evolved the new doctrine of efficiency and has produced new types of workers. Modern education and modern opportunity have produced the new woman of whom we hear much, but what of the new lady? The old-fashioned lady, as we are told,* has vanished. That was inevitable and need cause no alarm. She went with the old-fashioned woman and the old-fashioned home. The new woman has come, but with her must come the new lady, the intelligent gentlewoman, of trained intellect, of cultivated mind, of enlarged vision, of broadened sympathies, of vitalized purpose, of spiritualized temper. She has come, she is here, though her voice be but faintly heard above the clatter and din of a noisy age. She is here, though her presence go unnoticed in the glare and glitter of flashing fashions, and though her influence be but dimly felt in the onrush of a rampant commercialism. She is here. Society will not fail of this type. But it is not sufficient to rest in this confidence. Never was there a time when society more imperatively needed the redemptive influence of the lady, never was there an age when the intelligent gentlewoman received a stronger call to service, never was there a period when the establishment of this type and the conscious choice of this ideal of womanhood needed greater emphasis; for it is she who must displace vulgarity with refinement, bad taste with propriety, bad manners with fine breeding. It is she who must teach that efficiency, public spirit, civic enterprise, social leadership, are not inconsistent with poise, moderation, restraint. It is she who through balance of judgment, grace of manner, dignity of bearing, purity of spirit, and nobility of conduct must establish the supreme worth of beauty of personality and make it a conscious ideal. It is she who through spiritual force and grace of character must harmonize social discords, elevate social standards, purify social aims, reinspire chivalrous respect for womanhood, reinstate generous honor for manhood.

To whom more than to the college woman shall we look for allegiance to this ideal, for the fulfilment of this mission? *Noblesse oblige.* Shall not the heirs of culture become its guardians and transmitters, shall they not realize that they are trustees of a noble heritage that belongs in perpetuity to the race? Shall they not develop its finest resources, increase its most treasured holdings, and so become in turn generous legators to society?

*Comer, "The Vanishing Lady," *Atlantic,* Dec., 1911.

A MILITANT SUFFRAGIST'S MILITANT PLAN FOR PEACE

IN the *Survey* for December 5, 1914, Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, erstwhile militant and writer of destruction as a means of bringing about a pet "reform," proposes "a union of women for constructive peace."

Mrs. Lawrence writes:

"Women may well stand aghast at the spectacle of the ruin brought upon the continent of Europe, by the forces of organized destruction and death.

"For this cataclysm women bear no responsibility whatever.

* * * * * * *

"Men have often passed sweeping, depreciating verdicts upon women as a sex. They have defended their own monopoly of government by assertions that women have no knowledge of business; that they are lacking in practical efficiency.

"To-day it is for men to stand down and for the women whom they have belittled to take the seat of judgment. No picture, however overdrawn, of women's ignorance, error, or folly could exceed in fantastic yet tragic horror the spectacle which male governments are furnishing history to-day. The foundation of the structure of civilization which they have erected in Europe has proved rotten. The edifice seemingly so secure has collapsed. The failure of male statecraft in Europe is complete."

This picture of women in the seat of judgment seems a strange thing for a woman to draw.

Have the women of England had nothing to do with inculcating those principles of ethics and morality upon which men act? For the purpose of her argument Mrs. Lawrence declares they have not. "Women bear no responsibility whatever," for present conditions, she declares.

This denial of responsibility is followed by this statement:

"Women as the natural custodians of the human race have now for the sake of humanity to insist on their right to representation in the governments of nations."

We construe this to mean "the right to vote," as women are already "represented in the governments of nations."

Yet it seems that Mrs. Lawrence could not have meant "the right to vote," militant Suffragist though she be. For she goes on to say:

"At this supreme crisis of the world's history, a new force has entered into public life—a new force, generated by the woman's

movement. I believe a great campaign for organizing public opinion and bringing its pressure to bear upon the governments of the world could be initiated now by the woman's movement in America and carried through the length and breadth of the United States. Women of the neutral European states, women of England and Ireland, to say nothing of women of the other belligerent nations, would fall into line. A world-wide movement for constructive and creative peace such as the world has never yet seen might even now come into being—a movement which would influence the immediate development of humanity."

The suggestion here that reforms come about through an enlightened, educated public opinion does not accord with the suffrage doctrine of reform by the ballot. Nor is it consistent with Mrs. Lawrence's previous denial of woman's responsibility.

In closing her article Mrs. Lawrence says:

"When the history of this almost inconceivable world tragedy comes to be written, I fervently hope there will be one chapter telling of the part played by women, not only in the work of healing and replenishing wounded and mangled humanity, but in bringing to birth a new spirit—generating a new reconstructive force in the world. That reconstructive spirit must be embodied in a peace which shall keep the allies true to their slogan that this is a "war to end war"; a peace which shall give place for the progressive evolution of humanity, generation after generation, to an ever higher standard of physical, mental, moral and spiritual development."

To this article the following reply was made by Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, of Boston, in the issue of December 26, 1914:

"To the Editor: Mrs. Pethick Lawrence's plea for a Union of Women for Constructive Peace lacks conviction, coming as it does from one of the foremost leaders of a union of women for destructive violence. I am well aware that in saying this I shall be accused of failing to understand the motives of the militants. I do not think I misunderstand them, for I am also aware that the Kaiser considers himself the champion of peace. Judging from Mrs. Lawrence's remarks in your recent issue she and the Kaiser want peace in much the same way and on much the same terms.

"Throughout her article there is not one word of understanding of the terrible baptism of fire through which the world is passing—it is filled simply with sex antagonism from start to finish. She begins by washing her hands and those of all other women of all responsibility for the war. This was hardly necessary for no one had ever accused her or anyone sharing her views of a large enough outlook to make any such responsibility possible. Then she taunts all men with what she calls the failure of male governments to-day. This she does because she is unable to perceive the grandeur of those governments of men who have so rallied to protect the honor and the faith of the world.

"Finally having shown herself so blind to the present situation that she does not even recognize its nature, she speaks of this 'new spirit' which women have brought into the world and how it should dictate the terms of peace, which are, it is hardly necessary to add, to include woman suffrage.

"No wonder she ends her article with the hope that when the history of the war shall hereafter be written one chapter may tell of the part played by women. Are women so insignificant that their work must be treated as a thing by itself as one would write of the railroads—of the commissariat—of the bombardments and so forth? Women's work, like men's work, in war as in peace is everywhere that they are needed, and it can no more be detached from the whole than can the color of the flower from the petal which it glorifies.

"Women are actuated by the same motives as the men of their race, and, thank God! are no more likely to give up their honor for a supine peace than are their men—nor where they have the vision will they sacrifice the civilization, the liberty, the very life of the world, for any present ease, but rather will they help to win these back at however great a sacrifice. Then and then only can women talk of peace, and when that time comes they will not lack a voice in arranging the terms of that peace, although it will not be through the medium of the ballot box, but in the way that any wise woman can to-day make her views known in the councils of men.

"Mrs. William Lowell Putnam."

Following a statement that Mrs. Putnam erred in declaring Mrs. Lawrence a "militant," Mrs. Putnam again wrote to the *Survey*, which published these facts:

"Mrs. Pethick Lawrence's connection with militancy was never disputed until her present campaign for peace made such a course desirable. She was convicted and sentenced to imprisonment several times, the last one, so far as I know, being on May 22, 1912, when Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence, together with Mrs. Pankhurst, 'were found guilty at the Old Bailey on the charge of conspiracy and inciting their followers to malicious damage of property.' They were sentenced to nine months' imprisonment, but Mrs. Pankhurst and Mrs. Lawrence were released at the end of a month because of a hunger strike which they practised.

"Mrs. Lawrence finally 'withdrew her support' from Mrs. Pankhurst before the latter's latest outburst of frenzy, as her support had been not only moral and physical, but also of a very pecuniary nature and it was costing her pocket and Mr. Lawrence's too dear—but her support was not withdrawn until after her conviction for damage of property, which I have cited."

MORE ABOUT COLORADO

IN a letter to the editor of the Philadelphia *Evening Telegraph*, W. O. Jenkins says:

"Pennsylvania will soon vote on the question of equal suffrage, and it behooves its voters to obtain all the information possible.

"The writer voted for the ballot for women in Colorado believing the argument that such a change would purify politics.

"No one acquainted with the history of Colorado for the past twenty years would seriously contend that this result followed.

"From the balmy days of Haywood, Moyer and Harry Orchard up to this present day of the great coal strike Colorado has had by far the greatest amount of turmoil and violence of any State in our Union.

"This should not be blamed to the woman voter, but it does show that her influence as such is of no consequence either way. At least 98 per cent. of the women voters of Colorado care no more about elections (excepting those concerning the public schools) than they do about prize fights or wrestling matches.

"The vast majority of them know nothing about the initiative and referendum, recall, tariff, reclamation and other questions of government, and care less, and there is seldom an instance where the advice of some man is not sought and followed as to the proper candidates and measures to be voted for."

WOMAN'S WORK

NOTE—Challenged to prove that, "Woman's work has gone out of the home and into store, factory and shop," Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, president of the International Suffrage Alliance, states in "A Challenge Accepted," in the current issue of the *Woman Voter:* "Because * * * the work of our grandmothers has gone out of the home and into store, factory and shop, and he who denies it denies the fundamental facts of history," which inspired the following verses):

GRANDMA'S work, and a great deal more,
Has gone to the factory, shop and store;
But then, SHE, too, we're sad to say,
Has gone to a better land, we pray.

Grandpa, too, lost his old quill pen,
But there's still much work in the world for men.
While the spinning wheel has had its day,
HOME and MOTHER are here to stay.

"Woman's work has left the home!"
And from it now she, too, should roam;
So say the few who want the vote
Who never from the census note:

That SIXTEEN MILLION WOMEN WORKERS,
Wives in homes—not drones or shirkers,
*(Ninety-three per cent.—just look)
Have NO servants—"maid" or "cook."

And though they do not knit and sew
Quite like dear Grandma did, you know
Our BOYS AND GIRLS now need much more
Of good HOME TRAINING than of yore

To make them fit to do their best,
That MOTHER still gets little rest.
And that she surely now deserves
Who in HER SPHERE the State well serves.

"Home-made Children"—by their MOTHER,
Which they can be by no other,
Will do for MORE to make us great
Than all the laws in every State.

So why the cry: "No work in homes,"
And women now are "human drones"?
Sleek "slaves" but to amuse their sires,
"THEY do not know their OWN desires?"
"You ought to want a duty yet—
To Vote"—so says the suffragette,
And thinks that she alone can show
The way ALL women ought to go.

She cries: "Since I have naught to do,
I'll force new duties upon you;
Add burdens grave, with 'Votes for Me,'
'Tis thus I'd make all women free."

*After subtracting all persons engaged as housekeepers, cooks and servants listed in the last report of occupations, we have 16,772,133, or 93.6 per cent. of the 17,805,845 homes in the United States, necessarily operated without paid servants.

The Anti-Saloon Vote in Neighboring States

SUFFRAGIST speakers will find little to comment upon in the result of the anti-saloon vote in the spring elections, held April 6.

In Illinois, where women voted, only three counties were added to the "dry" list, and the *Chicago Tribune* reports:

"Women's votes had but little effect on the elections. In nearly all cases where the drys won the result would have been the same if only men's votes had been counted."

In Michigan, across the border of Illinois on the northeast, thirteen counties were voted "dry"—and only men voted.

In Wisconsin, across the border of Illinois on the northwest, a State of many brewing interests, not a single "dry" locality returned to the "wet" column, while many "wet" communities voted "dry," including eight cities.

A Statement About the "Woman's Protest"

Statement of the ownership, management, circulation, etc., required by the Act of August 24, 1912, of THE WOMAN'S PROTEST, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for April 1, 1915:

Editor: Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Managing ditor: Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Business Manager: Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Publisher: The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

Owners: The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, 37 West 39th Street, New York City. 175,000 members in 25 States. Mrs. A. M. Dodge, President, New York City; Mrs. Wm. B. Glover, Secretary, Fairfield, Conn.; Miss C. W. Stewart, Treasurer, Glen Ridge, N. J.

Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders, holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities: None.

MRS. ARTHUR M. DODGE.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this fourteenth day of April, 1915.

CHAS. EDGAR, Notary Public.

Commission expires March 30, 1917.

Suffragette—A woman who does not know what she wants, but knows she wants it.—*New York Evening Mail.*

"IGNORANCE OF THE REAL ISSUES AT STAKE"

By Mrs. George F. Arnold

In the Houston (Tex.) *Post* of February 21, 1915, the leading editorial makes this comment upon the article below, which is reprinted from its issue of that date:

"There appears on this page an address to the women of Texas by Mrs. George F. Arnold, a Houston woman of recognized character, intelligence and standing, upon the subject of equal suffrage. Mrs. Arnold numbers herself among probably the great majority of Texas women in opposition to the enfranchisement of women. It is a remarkable address she makes—remarkable for its plain statement of direct and incisive truths which must be crushed into the earth before the doctrine of woman's suffrage becomes a part of the law of the land."

THE following appeal to the women of Texas voices the sentiment of those women in Houston who are opposed to the equal suffrage program, and they are in an overwhelming majority. * * *

Indifference to and ignorance of the real issues at stake on the part of those opposing woman suffrage, reticence and womanly reserve, are a large part of the stock in trade on which the Suffragists rely to carry their movement on to success. A large majority of the men and women of Texas have not given the subject of woman suffrage any serious thought, nor considered the imminence of its blight on civilization.

The dividing line of sex is evident through all animate nature. The male *creates* and the female *conserves*. This is a law of nature as unbreakable as the law that fire consumes.

No one denies the "right" of women to vote, make roads or build bridges. But the 1 per cent. who hold this peculiar view have not the right to maintain that they represent the other 99 per cent.

Equality before the law is not what women—a few women—are clamoring for. Woman does not want the right of jury and military service. She does not want the right to pay her husband's debts, as he is compelled to pay hers. She does not want the right to be prosecuted for failure to support her husband as he may be for failure to support his wife. She does not want the right to pay taxes on her husband's property as he is compelled to pay taxes on her property. She does not want the right to pay damages if her husband is found guilty of slander or libel as he must pay for her guilt in like case.

She wants to vote as she wanted jam and sugar plums in her infancy.

The cry that women have been forced to take up the work of men is a fallacy. The census does show there are 8,000,000 feminine workers in the United States. It also plainly states that 53.7 per cent. of the women laborers are engaged in agricultural pursuits and in domestic and personal service. The agricultural laborers are employed on their own home farms. The domestic servants, dressmakers, seamstresses, milliners, hair dressers, are in the service of women. If their condition calls for amelioration, do women need the political vote in order to relieve their own employes?

About 4,000,000 women work in factories, shops, offices, etc. Fully half of this 4,000,000 voluntarily take up this outside work because they dislike the quiet and monotony of home life and wish to earn money to spend on pretty clothes, theaters, etc.

About 2,000,000 women have been forced to seek work to support themselves and those dependent on them. A large number of these involuntary laborers are turning out goods which the non-producing women use. Cannot women alleviate the condition of the laborers who indirectly work for them without recourse to the ballot? Let women decline to buy sweatshop garments, and cease to haunt the bargain counters, and the sweatshops will close. No vote is needed here.

Voluntary workers by taking jobs which rightfully belong to their brothers have reduced wages and decreased the number of jobs, and they have impaired the chances for marriage. Jobless men dare not marry, and the social evil flourishes.

Instead of the Legislature passing a bill submitting the question of woman suffrage to the male voters, let an informal ballot of the women be taken on the proposition. This is the only fair and honorable method for finally settling the matter.

You, the mothers, wives and young women, are in danger of being drawn into the muddy arena of politics; in danger of being forced to neglect home and children for public activities; in danger of losing your individual, unpartisan influence by being dragged out to electioneer and vote with a party on all political questions; for otherwise your vote would be thrown away. The alluring prospect of reforming men and purifying politics is all bosh. If women cannot reform men by the example of righteous living and the gentle administration of sympathy and love, they cannot do so by the use of the ballot.

In each generation women have the world of men in their arms. If they are not able to instill righteousness into the character of their sons they cannot reform men whom they have ill-formed during the tender years of infancy and boyhood.

The thing women say they are striving for is all so simple. Raise good and able men and in one generation the world will be governed by good and able men.

THE FALLACY OF "EXTENSIVE MOTHERHOOD"

HAD Beatrice Forbes-Robertson Hale chosen a less ambitious title for her book, "What Women Want," the result would have been more coherent. As it is, like all self-constituted spokesmen in behalf of our entire sex, she has succeeded in giving us a very sincere interpretation of the viewpoint of that particular group of Suffragists with which she is affiliated. Naturally, the needs of women, like those of men, are too varied to be treated offhand in a single volume, and no one would dream of summing up the male sex in such fashion. Mrs. Hale has attempted too large a canvass.

This attempt, while well written, is in no sense epoch-making, in this respect differing little from any of the other attempts, pro or con, to make copy out of the so-called "woman's movement." For this minority agitation to prove that woman's development hinges on the ballot, that its use once every two years will entirely rejuvenate society, is in no sense a movement of women as a sex. It is a particularly well advertised and well-financed political campaign. Were the world really in the throes of a "woman's movement" which awakened women and stirred them to a higher idealism, this surge would have the inevitable concomitants of all great human awakenings to better things. Like the Renaissance or the Reformation, this awakening, so-called, being world wide instead of limited to a continent, would be accompanied by unassailable evidences of an emotionable and spiritual uplift. Its passing would leave humanity enriched with deathless music, art, literature. These would be spontaneous and natural. Where are these trumpet calls to a better to-morrow? Sadly missing. Sex-consciousness, like self-consciousness, is not the crucible in which greatness of spirit flourishes. Mediocrity prevails in a commercialized world in which women are descending into

the struggle for temporal place and power, instead of inspiring humanity to higher things. We are qualified to judge the suffrage movement by its fruits. After sixty-five years' insistence on the "awakening," what have these women given humanity? Absolutely nothing of permanent worth. Mrs. Hale's book, like all the other resultants, possesses an interest which is purely ephemeral. The only real contribution to letters which may be claimed by the great movement is that made to yellow journalism—our most transient school.

Basing her theories on the assumption that women, in order to develop a higher motherhood, must be extensive rather than intensive in their interests, Mrs. Hale endeavors to prove that the broad life is necessarily the public life, *i. e.*, the political life. Her highest estimate of the home is a sanitary place where food is prepared. She believes that the factory, the shop, the primary and the polling booth will develop the mother spirit in women which the nursery, the kitchen, the market, the school and the church cannot inculcate. In brief, if she can round us together she believes our collective motherhood will effect what our private motherhood is unable to effect. She believes we can uplift the mass collectively instead of patiently striving to uplift the unit. Mrs. Hale devoutly believes that environment is stronger than character. She thinks people are the result of conditions instead of the reverse. If we all get together we can change conditions. The broad life with the capital L is only to be lived in crowds. That human nature will be the same after we herd it Mrs. Hale does not believe. Men are more advanced than women to-day (at least according to the Suffragists) because they have learned how to do their work in crowds. Women must do the same thing and then the work of women will be accomplished better. Those of us who think the world is too much with us as it is and who advocate a higher development of children by a withdrawal from crowds and a simpler life are reactionaries —and Mrs. Hale says some uncomplimentary things about us.

The deepening in the individual of the sense of personal responsibility will never be accomplished en masse, as Mrs. Hale advocates. The real awakening of both men and women is a matter of inner growth, and may be accomplished as well in a kitchen as anywhere else. All is grist that comes to the spiritual mill. Success, of course, must not be measured in physical terms. We cannot estimate it in terms of worldly phraseology. It can never be gauged in dollars and cents nor in election to public office. In this deepening of the sense of personal and social responsibility in the individual, upon which depends all human progress, the weight of the struggle rests on each individual. There is only a limited amount which the rest of humanity may contribute. "He that conquereth himself is greater than he that taketh a city" has no part in the crowd doctrine. When Mrs. Hale states that "The most effective tool of social service is an organized vote," she has originated her own meaning for service. No great teacher has ever so taught us.

Moreover, "What Women Want," in its endeavor to make an appeal which will be universal and popular, is necessarily self-contradictory. After stating "While admitting the backwaters, however, and even conceding them still to the majority," its author pleads for the ballot in the name of democracy. If the majority of us are still in the backwater state we are entitled to a representative government, and anyone who seeks to foist off on us ideals which are not the average is a traitor to democracy and does not love and trust the average. Only by spreading the doctrines one admires until they are embraced by the majority can idealists seek to win. Leaders must look back and call, not seek to coerce.

Browning, in his Paracelsus, teaches us a more fundamental creed:

"There is an inmost center in us all
Where truth abides in fulness; and around,
Wall upon wall, the gross flesh hems it in,
This perfect, clear perception, which is truth.
A baffling and pervading carnal mesh
Binds it and makes all error; and to know
Rather consists in opening out a way
Whence the imprisoned splendor may escape
Than in effecting entry for a light
Supposed to be without."

"SUFFRAGE PICTURES OVERDRAWN AND UNTRUE"

THE following letter appeared in the *Nebraska State Journal* on March 12th:

Believing that you do not desire your readers to be misinformed regarding the laws of sister States, I submit the following:

In your issue of March 1st, Inez C. Philbrick had a long letter defending the suffrage play entitled "Your Girl and Mine," against criticisms of those who witnessed the play, who declared the pictures were overdrawn and untrue. To prove her contention she said among other things: "In Delaware, Georgia, Maryland, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia to-day the father is sole guardian of the children. He has sole authority while living and can will them away from the mother living or unborn." When this charge was made the writer communicated with the various attornies-general of the States mentioned and asked whether they had any such laws, and as far as heard from the responses are:

"I beg to say that the attorney-general is made the advisor of the governor and state house officers only, but I don't mind saying that your informant is very much mistaken and no such law as he mentions exists in Georgia. Warren Grice, Georgia."

"I know of no law giving the father the right to will living or unborn children away from the mother. Frank M. Thompson, Tennessee."

"The charge against the State of Delaware referred to you is unjustified. Instead of such being the case my experience and observation has been such as to justify the assertion that, other things being equal, the mother has far and away the best standing before our law in the matter of possession of and control over the person of her child. Josiah O. Wolcott, Delaware."

"Under our law the father has the technical right to appoint a testamentary guardian for his minor children even though he leaves a widow surviving him. Under appropriate legal proceedings, however, the rights of the mother can always be fully protected. Edgar Allan Poe, Maryland."

"Fathers may appoint guardians for their children during any part of infancy by deed in writing attested by two witnesses, or by last will and testament. T. F. West, Florida."

"In reply to your letter of March 1st, in which you say it has been charged publicly that in South Carolina the father is the sole guardian of the children and that he has sole authority to will them away from the mother, I beg to say that the charge is untrue and no such statute law now exists, never has existed, and, in my humble judgment, never will exist in this State. W. Hampton Cobb, South Carolina."

The above proves that the pictures in this respect were overdrawn and untrue.

JOHN G. MAHER.

Suffrage must be given to *all* women or refused to *all* women. A vote to one woman must be a vote to *all* women, vicious or virtuous, ignorant or educated, criminal or honest. Meager educational qualifications may be imposed, as they are on the male voters in some sections, but the franchise cannot possibly be granted to a selected portion of the female population and it cannot be restricted by the many qualifications that would be necessary to ensure only the ballots of the intelligent, the educated and the ethical. Woman suffrage will increase the number of votes cast, but it cannot, in the very nature of human conditions, increase it for the better, while it is indubitable that it may increase it for the worse.

TWO EXAMPLES OF THE NEW SUFFRAGE ETHICS

A LOWERING of ethical standards is not one of those "reforms" which Suffragists promise "if women get the vote."

Recent episodes in Boston do not promise any improvement in such standards.

The facts are as follows:

The Boston Committee of the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association presented a Fashion Fête at the Toy Theater in March. Gowns worn by a century of American women were displayed in a variety of settings and the affair was a great success.

Mrs. Barrett Wendell describes what followed. She writes:

"On March 16th and 17th a body of women who oppose the further extension of woman's suffrage hired the Toy Theater for the representation of fashions in dress during the last century. The performance was a great success, but the management of the fête had an experience with the management of the theater about which I should like the opinion of prominent Suffragists. Arriving at the theater on Tuesday afternoon the lady in charge of the performance found to her surprise several of the regular ushers of the theater scattered among the young girls who had undertaken this task for the afternoon. She spoke to the man in charge, saying that the regular staff was not required as she was amply equipped, and suggesting that they be sent away, but he somewhat insistently maintained that as they were there they had best remain. Too late to stop it on that day, it came to the knowledge of the lady responsible that those ushers had been going about among the audience distributing leaflets which, through a thin veneer of compliment to those who had hired the theater, were designed in reality to undermine the cause for which it had been hired. The following morning she visited the "management" and inquired of the lady who holds this position whether hiring the theater did not confer full title for the period covered by the contract, the power to grant or refuse the right to photograph the performance, etc. She was informed that it did confer such title. On showing the leaflet with its patent compliment and veiled innuendo, and suggesting that it might then naturally be supposed to have been issued by the only people who had a right so to do, she was assured by the lady that this was not likely to happen as she had written it herself. She said it seemed to her to be an amusing deed. The humor of it she explained by also saying that she was an ardent Suffragist and that her friends had objected to her letting her theater for anti-suffrage propaganda, but that she thought herself justified in earning money for it in this way. It seemed to this woman 'smart—"a joke" she called it—to accept money for a contract which she was all the time surreptitiously vitiating.

"I should be glad to know if this action is endorsed or repudiated by other Suffragists, for it would be well for the community to know the standard of business honor which women are expecting to carry out in politics. This letter gives an opportunity for repudiation of this action."

The only "repudiation" is the following letter addressed to the editor of the Boston *Herald* by the manager of the theater, a letter which defends the action:

To the Editor of The Herald:

Your suggestion in the editorial concerning "Mr. Crocker's Anxiety," that a brief letter throwing any light upon the subject would be welcome, gives me courage to come out with a public apology to the committee in charge of the anti-suffrage entertainment recently given at the Toy Theater. I have already apologized privately.

Anything more than a friendly joke was never intended. As 90 per cent., at least, of my friends are Antis, including my husband and favorite sister, it has never occurred to me to consider the difference as anything to quarrel about.

Really "suffrage literature" was not "circulated," only a little slip was offered in the foyer, headed, "Compliments of the Management, etc.," and reading:

The conservative element in the community is incalculably valuable.

It consists almost exclusively of those fortunate persons who have had the best of the opportunities and privileges which the present order has to offer.

Cultivation, refinement and sensitive taste are its qualities.

When the radicals win for all women the right and responsibilities of full citizenship, this conservative element will continue to be immeasurably useful and precious.

The chairman of the committee asked that it should not be given out next day, as it said such nice things about the Antis she feared that there would be confusion in people's minds—they would think she had written it!

Jane W. Gale.

Boston, March 23d.

That this not an isolated exception of "the New Suffrage Ethics" is indicated by this letter from the same issue of the Boston *Herald:*

To the Editor of The Herald:

Many Cambridge people were invited to attend Frau Rosika Schwimmer's talk on "Peace" at Brattle Hall on Friday, March 19, and were assured that it really was a peace meeting. It proved, however, to be a suffrage meeting, only thinly disguised, and after Frau Schwimmer, wrought up by a recital of the horrors of war as it affects women and children, a collection was taken up—not for the war victims, not for the furtherance of peace, but for the Cambridge suffrage campaign fund!

Frau Schwimmer claims to represent the women of sixteen countries. It would be interesting to know what proportion of them ever heard of her, and if they did hear that she was using their misery to raise money for the Cambridge Suffragists, just exactly what would they think of her.

Anne Hathaway Gulick.

Cambridge, March 23d.

"THE RIGHT OF A LADY TO BE TREATED AS A GENTLEMAN"

(*From the Boston Herald*)

The male colleagues of lady legislators in woman suffrage States have suddenly discovered that they have social as well as political and parliamentary problems on their hands as a result of the presence of the female representatives in the halls of the State capitols. The demands being made on them provoke confusion in many instances. In the Arizona Legislature within the week Mrs. Berry, representative from one district, demanded that smoking cease as a mark of respect to her presence in the chamber "as a lady," and now, in Denver, Senator Helen Ring Robinson is stirred to emotion and demands her rights to "be treated as a gentleman."

It would seem as if the time was ripe for a joint convention of the legislative officers of all the suffrage States to determine what the official attitude should be toward the women. When elected to legislative bodies are they to be treated as ladies, as Representative Mrs. Berry of Arizona demands, or as gentlemen, as Senator Helen Ring Robinson of Colorado desires?

The Colorado incident grew out of a debate between Senator Barela and Senator Robinson, in which the male senator charged the female with constantly taking advantage of her wearing skirts to do things a man would not do. "I demand," said Senator Robinson, "that I be treated as a gentleman," her voice quivering with anger. The chairman called for order, and Senator Barela, with wisdom it would seem, moderated his manner of speech.

"THE RETORT COURTEOUS"—(SUFFRAGE)

By Mrs. Helen M. Lucas, Marietta, Ohio.

THE experience and observation of women who try to do their part in defense of our present system of government are probably very much alike. Therefore, I give some specimens of my experience with political women. As soon as I took up the defense of woman's right to exemption from political duties I was assailed with epithets—"narrow-minded," "prejudiced," "reactionary," "obstacle to progress," "dog in the manger," "hog in the trough," "Paulette" (St. Paul is an object of their particular contempt), "eighteenth century mind," "fossil," etc.

They charged me with falsifying laws. One wrote lengthy articles bringing my full name into almost every insulting paragraph, and the frequency of that kind of paragraph was astonishing. A male Suffragist ended one of his tirades by ascribing to me lack of brains, and heart, and humanity. I mention him because of the praise he received from suffrage women in following numbers of the same periodical. One of them recommended my reading his contributions over many times as a means of self-improvement.

Suffrage women ridicule us for appearing in politics. They call us aggressive, though they know our work is entirely defensive. They say we go in to keep other women out, meaning that we wish merely to thwart someone.

Another Suffragist told me I would be called on to prove what I said about Mrs. Hale. I answered I was ready at any time. Still another said to me, "In some places when an Anti is seen with a pencil taking notes she is put out." When I reminded her the meeting was much advertised and everyone urged to go, she said: "Yes, *this* one, but they get in other meetings; else how do they find out things." She said they had decided to sue the editor of a paper for printing my articles; suit would be brought the next morning. As nothing followed this bluff I asked the editor about it. My question was the first he heard of it. These three women, last mentioned, were defending Mrs. Hale, and I have never heard of any Suffragists repudiating her. The woman who had told me I would be called on to prove what I said afterwards read to an audience her indictment of Antis. When I saw in a paper that she had done so I asked her if she would not have it printed in that paper. She refused. Another woman read in public selections from different persons designed to prove that the opposition to woman suffrage was by vice and greed, and worldly, selfish women. I tried to get her to print it or give it to the public or to me in some way so I could find out what it was. To my friendly remarks and urgent appeals she replied: "No! I will *not*. It would not be wise. I do not want to see anything of yours. We are better employed than in reading such things. You ought to know what they say you read. We have more important things to do than keeping things going back and forth." Imagine this in anything but politics. Suffrage women often try to prevent an answer to anything they make public. One woman told me why they prevented my answering something. She said in perfect seriousness, "If the people there had heard your side we could not have got so many to sign our petition."

The purpose of this incomplete sketch is to call attention to these considerations. Men think refusing to sign suffrage petitions would be opposing women, overlooking the greater number they are opposing by signing. They fail to see that it is not fair to bring the State into another turmoil of political contention in a short time after the measure has been defeated decisively. Do husbands, fathers, sons and brothers want the women of their families subjected to such treatment as working Antis have received? They may think the women of their families will keep out of politics, but the time may come soon when they will feel compelled to take action. Diseases spread if not checked. Resistance should be made now.

A Self-Sustaining Anti Headquarters

How to make an anti-suffrage headquarters self-sustaining is brought out in a letter received from Mrs. H. M. Lucas, of Marietta, Ohio, which contains a message for other branches of the organization.

Mrs. Lucas explains that a lunch room, or tea room, was undertaken in the headquarters. The store was decorated and made inviting by fitting up a reading and rest room along one side. Fifteen banners and posters cover the wall and are read eagerly. Those women in charge of furnishing the lunches "receive whatever they can make from the lunches in consideration of talking, distributing literature and getting signatures to slips 'I am Opposed to Woman Suffrage.'"

(*From Louisville Courier-Journal*)

So far as the contention that woman suffers gross disabilities under the law is concerned, it needs no more than a moderate familiarity with modern legislation to detect the absurd degree of exaggeration into which its supporters have been led by their enthusiasm.

A School for Making Anti-Suffrage Speakers

A SCHOOL for anti-suffrage speakers has just been undertaken by the Massachusetts Association. Sessions will be held weekly for six weeks and the classes will be subdivided into small groups in order to give sufficient individual attention.

The announcement of the course reads:

"The object of the school, which will be under the direction of Dr. Ernest Bernbaum, is to enable its members (1) to master the fundamental facts and principles of the anti-suffrage case, (2) to learn how to keep in touch with important new developments in the subject, (3) to present the anti-suffrage case in the soundest and most telling manner, (4) to refute the chief suffrage arguments, (5) to answer those questions from the audience which are likeliest to arise occasionally at public meetings.

"From week to week, regular assignments of reading will be given, covering the subject in a systematic manner. On the basis of this reading, combined with their own ideas, the members of the school will prepare their speeches. Portions of these speeches they will deliver at the school meetings, where suggestions for possible improvements will be made. Every member will be encouraged to present the arguments in her own individual way; but in order to make it impossible for Suffragists to maintain that anti-suffrage speakers contradict one another, or that any one of them maintains inconsistent points of view, any divergence from the fundamental anti-suffrage principles will be pointed out. At some of the meetings Dr. Bernbaum will make brief pro-suffrage speeches and will aid the members of the school in refuting them. He will also assume the part of a questioner at public meetings, and give training in making effective replies.

"The Anti-Suffrage Association will regard those who acquire the knowledge and training which the school provides as unusually well qualified to begin to serve as speakers in the campaign."

(*From Louisville Courier-Journal*)

The man who would claim more for his sons than his daughters, less for his wife than himself is but half a man. Suffrage touches none of the blessed real things of life. It is a most imperfect means to a most undefined and unsatisfactory end. Adequately met it would put upon woman responsibilities which most wise men would gladly escape. In case she gets it her disappointment will be proportioned to her genuine concern in public affairs, for it will bring her nothing she expects of it. It would merely double a suffrage already unequal and inadequate. For woman, it is full of illusion and delusion.

WORKING AND VOTING AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

MAINE

AUGUSTA, MAINE: March 24.—Woman suffrage failed to pass in the House. Although the vote was 88 to 59, it fell short of the two-thirds vote required. The Senate last week passed the resolution by a wide margin.

MASSACHUSETTS

OUR report for the April *Remonstrance* will show a net membership of 30,039 women of voting age; Branch Committees 112 with many more in process of formation. Thirty-nine meetings held during March and already more than a dozen arranged for April.

The luncheon to be held April 20th before the annual meeting will be largely attended, as evidenced by the advance sale of tickets.

The Fashion Fête was given March 16th and 17th, the demand for tickets being so great that a second performance was necessary.

Rubber stamps with the legend "Vote NO on Woman Suffrage" are being used very generally by our women.

Already this month over 13,000 pieces of literature have been sent out and material furnished for a large number of debates; several town libraries have also asked for our publications stating they were being flooded by the other side.

A school for speakers opened Monday, the 22d, under the supervision of Dr. Ernest Bernbaum, instructor at Harvard University and already a large number of our members have enrolled as students.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

EXTRACT FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE LETTER, MARCH 17, 1915

* * * There has been a very great effort by the Suffragists to get a bill for municipal suffrage through the Legislature, but it was not brought up in the Senate and was defeated in the House on March 17th by a vote of 230 to 121.

The Suffragists held three or four public meetings, one just the evening before the vote. They hired a lawyer to attend to their cause, had a room for suffrage headquarters, hired a woman to keep the room and write their suffrage notes for the papers, bought large numbers of yellow daffodils which they urged every man and woman in the State House that day to wear and had yellow banners saying "Votes for Women" all ready to wave.

The Antis had one excellent public meeting in Representatives Hall, addressed by Mrs. Thomas Allen, of Boston, and Prof. Bernbaum. The hall was filled. The committee hearing on the bill was also in Representatives Hall in the evening, when both sides were heard, and even some who had favored suffrage said that the Antis had the best of the argument and made a better impression. Our notes in the papers have never been undignified or disagreeable, and on the day of voting we went quietly into the gallery wearing our pink roses. More on the floor spoke for them than for us, and one of the daily papers said, "The Pros had the speeches and the Antis had the votes."

NEW JERSEY

TRENTON, N. J., March 26.—The special election on the votes-for-women resolution and other amendments to the Constitution will be held September 14th, according to announcement to-day by Assemblyman Peacock of Burlington, who introduced the suffrage measure.

The bill providing for the election is being prepared, but it cannot be offered for passage until all the Constitutional amendments pending in the form of concurrent resolutions have been acted upon.

The suffrage resolution and that of Senator Hennesy, providing for an easier method of amending the Constitution, have passed both houses.

NEW YORK

IN New York State we are continuing to work along constructive and educational lines. During February and March speakers have presented the arguments of the opposition to woman suffrage before political clubs in Manhattan, Brooklyn and on Long Island, before granges up the State and several church clubs. There have been meetings daily, often three and sometimes four in a day. A booth at Ithaca during Farmers' Week brought us many signatures, and Miss Lucy Price spoke before the students of Cornell during the week.

The study classes conducted by Mrs. Frank J. Goodwin were largely attended and many new members enrolled as a result of the interest awakened by them.

The Association had a booth at the "Made in the U. S. A." exposition for one week. Over a thousand signatures were given, literature was distributed and roses, buttons and pennants sold. The closing day, Saturday, was Anti-Suffrage Rally Day, when speeches were made, afternoon and evening, by Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, Miss Marjorie Dorman and Miss Lucy Price. The most recent event, the Café Dansant, given at the Hotel Astor in the big ballroom, was attended by members of the associations in the three neighboring campaign States and was a great success, both as an entertainment and financially.

A conference of the chairmen of the up-State auxiliaries was held at the office, both morning and afternoon sessions of which were attended by large delegations. Interesting reports were given of work already accomplished and much enthusiasm expressed regarding the activities planned for the coming months.

Many meetings are booked, when speakers will give the anti-suffrage side only, or will debate the question.

It is no longer necessary to depend on meetings for signatures and numbers. Scores of people come to the office "to sign" and get literature to distribute.

RHODE ISLAND

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND: March 25—The House of Representatives by a vote of 65 to 31 sustained a committee's recommendation that action on a bill granting women the right to vote for Presidential electors be postponed indefinitely.

TEXAS

The Constitutional Amendment for woman suffrage was defeated by the Texas House of Representatives on March 6, 1915, by a vote of 90 to 32, 94 being necessary to pass the measure. By a parliamentary trick the bill for submitting the question to the people was given another chance in the House and may pass there, but will be killed in the Senate.

As yet there is no organized opposition to woman suffrage in Texas and the amendment was fought by Mrs. James B. Wells, almost single-handed. The work of organization will begin at once. The psychic wave of fear that attends the browbeating, menacing tactics of many Suffragists makes the work of opposition uselessly difficult. It is a secret moral enemy and very baffling, but when confronted with the actual danger of a suffrage amendment, the women of Texas will be sure to organize.

Letters from Austin and Houston report the Suffragists as "disturbed at opposition and vindictive."

WISCONSIN

The question of woman suffrage in Wisconsin was passed upon by an Assembly committee on March 31st.

The Committee on State Affairs, by a 6 to 5 vote, recommended for passage a bill providing a referendum on the question of full suffrage for women. Suffragists are in Madison in considerable numbers to push the bill and are working actively throughout the State in its support.

A similar amendment was defeated in the State election two years ago.

NOTES AND COMMENT

SUFFRAGE SPEAKER—Have I made myself plain?

VOICE IN REAR—No. Nature.—*Gargoyle.*

Sylvia Pankhurst was the principal speaker of a delegation which visited the war office in London recently to protest vehemently against the tyrannical "man-made" rule that soldiers' wives receiving separate allowances must not get drunk or lead scandalous lives.

The Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association is sending out the following appeal:

We need a Campaign fund of $100,000. We have raised $30,000.

We appeal to you, fellow citizen, whether you are a man and enjoy full suffrage, or a woman and desire it, to help us now when our opportunity is here. Do not put us off because of the demands made upon you by the Red Cross and the relief funds for the sufferers from the war. Urgent as these are, remember they are after all only palliatives, to alleviate conditions fundamentally wrong. Ours is a cause that strikes at the conditions themselves.

The Philadelphia *Public Ledger* has taken a straw vote on the suffrage issue. Pennsylvania, like New York, will vote on a constitutional amendment the coming fall. While no great reliance can be placed upon straw votes, they are interesting. The Philadelphia straw vote shows that public sentiment in that city is not widely divided. Out of a total of 519 votes there is shown a majority of nineteen votes against the woman suffrage amendment. The straw vote proportion applied to the State vote of Pennsylvania would give an approximate majority against the suffrage amendment of 40,000.—*Editorial Knickerbocker Press, Albany, N. Y.*

"Alice in Wonderland" is a real suffrage tale and Lewis Carroll never suspected that that was what he was writing, according to Miss Alice Gerstenberg, the dramatizer of "Alice in Wonderland," who addressed an audience at the suffrage shop in New York recently.

"It is about as foolish for me, who am trying to be a dramatist, to make a suffrage speech as the things in 'Alice in Wonderland' are," said Miss Gerstenberg.

"Just about," said one of the spectators in a stage whisper.

(*From the New York Call, Socialist*)

When you pick up the receiver of your telephone don't say "hello"; say "votes for women." This is a suggestion from some ardent Suffragists. They claim that the constant repetition of the familiar words will act as a form of agitation. Surely it is one that can be widely practised and without any special difficulty.

We are constantly told that woman suffrage is "sure to come" and that it is only a matter of time when it will have arrived with all its attendant evils. This is untrue. There is no positive assurance that an active, energetic and fanatical minority is bound to force such a political condition upon an unwilling majority, unless that majority be so complaisant as to allow its wishes to be overruled through its own indifference.

(*From a Press Despatch.*)

TARRYTOWN, N. Y., March 18.—Although women were eligible to vote in the village elections in Westchester County a surprisingly small number went to the polls.

Three hundred women were eligible in Hastings-on-Hudson, but only three voted. One hundred and fifteen could have voted in Dobbs Ferry, but only 15 turned out. In Ardsley-on-Hudson 80 women were eligible, but only 20 went.

It has been established by evidence in Indianapolis that the price paid for votes on election day was $1 each, and a good many Suffragettes are said now to doubt the value of the ballot to women.—*N. Y. Evening Sun.*

In a recent issue of *Scribner's* there appeared a story describing how Suffragists were appealing for the votes of wounded soldiers whom they were nursing. Now we find American Suffragists adopting the same methods of propaganda in earnest.

(*From New York Times, March 28*)

Voters in the bread line established by Edward Grantmont at 39 East Nineteenth Street will be appealed to by the Women's Political Union to-morrow afternoon at 5 o'clock. When the men have finished with the 2,000 cups of coffee and the 300 loaves of bread which are given away daily by Mr. Grantmonth, they will be invited indoors and Miss Kathleen Taylor, Miss Winona Marlin and Mrs. Walter Chambers will tell them how much their help is needed to get votes for women.

It is with the indifferent and undecided male voters that the question of woman suffrage lies. Women cannot have the ballot save through the votes of men. The suffrage men will vote solidly for it; the anti-suffrage men will vote solidly against it. The danger lies with the chivalrous and indifferent men, who either vote "Yes" because they think it a matter of slight importance in which to please the ladies or stay away from the polls entirely.

At the Mississippi Valley conference of Suffragists, which met in Indianapolis last week, two topics for discussion were, "Who are our allies?" and "Who are our enemies?" Among the strongest of their allies they can number the Mormons, the Socialists and the I. W. W.'s. Among their enemies they must now number the anti-saloon people, who are opposing suffrage in Alabama and were a large factor in its defeat in Ohio. It was formerly believed that woman suffrage would do away with saloons, but this is an exploded theory. According to Senator Works, of California, San Francisco alone has 3,500 saloons! As the report of the collector of internal revenue for 1913 showed that in proportion to population two liquor licenses were issued in the States where women had the ballot to one in States where only male suffrage obtains, it is no wonder the anti-saloon people are opposing woman suffrage.

REAL SEX EQUALITY

(*From the Buffalo Express.*)

"We want suffrage for peace," declares an advocate of suffrage and sufferer from war. But would we get it? Are not the women of the warring countries just as keen for war as the men? In England are not the women the most active recruiting sergeants? Even in this neutral country do not the women divide as sharply on lines of racial sympathy as their husbands and brothers?

Why can't this question of the ballot be discussed on its merits, without pretence that women's hearts and minds differ radically in their workings from the like organs in masculine frames? Women should have the ballot—*if they should have it*—because they are human beings and taxpayers and workers, not because they belong to a supposedly superior sex. Those who would give woman the ballot as a means of reforming society either don't know what they are talking about or are not talking about what they know. Intellectually and morally, women are neither better nor worse than men. If this be treason, we're glad of it.

THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Complete set, 50 cts. Single copies, 5 cts.

Selected packages, 25 cts.

PAMPHLETS

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Should We Ask for the Suffrage? *Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer*
Woman's Relation to Government *Mrs. Wm. F. Scott*
New Zealand and Australia, etc.
The Blank Cartridge Ballot *Rossiter Johnson*
Address (Made before Constitutional Convention, 1894) *Hon. Elihu Root*
Taxation and Suffrage *Frederick Dwight*
Woman and the Law *Francis M. Scott*
First Legislative Address *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
Woman Suffrage *Carl Schurz*
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy, etc.
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law
Dodgers

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman Suffrage Opposed to Woman's Rights *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Militant and the Child *Mrs. F. M. Scott*
Woman's Rights *vs.* Woman's Suffrage *Mrs. A. J. George*
Equality of Suffrage Means the Debasement, etc. *John R. Dos Passos*
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation *Minnie Bronson*
Wage-Earning Woman and the State *Minnie Bronson*
The Relation of the Sexes to Government *Prof. Edward Cope*
A Talk to Women on the Suffrage Question *Miss Emily P. Bissell*
Should Women Vote? *Joseph Gilpin Pyle*
Feminism and Socialism *Reprint from Unpopular Review*
An Open Letter to Clergymen
Dodgers—Statistics

Silk Pins.....10c. each Ribbon....10c. and 15c. a yard
Celluloid Buttons.....5c. Pennants.....15c. and 25c.
New Poster Stamps....35c. a hundred

NEW YORK STATE MEN'S ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO POLITICAL SUFFRAGE FOR WOMEN

27 William Street Room 1823 New York City

Brief before Rules Committee, Washington, D. C., Dec. 4, 1913 *Everett P. Wheeler*
Questionaire
Women and The Vote *Everett P. Wheeler*
Feminist Principle Biologically Unsound *Prof. William I. Sedgwick*

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

Woman Adrift ($1.50) *Harold Owen*
The Nature of Woman ($1.25) *J. Lionel Tayler*
Vocation of Woman ($1.50) *Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun*
The Business of Being a Woman ($1.50) *Ida Tarbell*
The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage ($1.00) *Sir Almroth Wright*
The Ladies' Battle ($1.00) *Molly Elliott Seawell*
Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)
The Unrest of Women ($1.00) *E. S. Martin*
Votes for Men (50c.)
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) *Grace Duffield Goodwin*
Woman and the Republic (25c.) *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

These can be obtained by applying to

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

We recommend to our readers THE LIVE ISSUE, published weekly. Subscription, 50c. Office, 345 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. Also, THE REMONSTRANCE; subscription, 25c.; 687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women:

Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage *Francis Parkman*
Argument before U. S. Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage *Mrs. A. J. George*
Of What Benefit to Woman?
Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage *Jeannette L. Gilder*
Letter to Legislative Committee *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? *Frank Foxcraft*
Taxpaying Suffrage *Charles R. Saunders*
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and not to Men
Opinions of Eminent Persons Against Woman Suffrage
Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage *Ida M. Tarbell*
Woman Suffrage in Practice—An Answer to George Creel
Address in Opposition to Woman Suffrage *Mrs. George A. Caswell*

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association,
KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615
687 Boylston Street BOSTON, MASS.

Selected Packages, 25c.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

.....1915

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....year's subscription

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State .....

Subscription Rate, $1.00 a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....